

Some stability properties of c_0 -saturated spaces

DENNY H. LEUNG

Abstract

A Banach space is c_0 -saturated if all of its closed infinite dimensional subspaces contain an isomorph of c_0 . In this article, we study the stability of this property under the formation of direct sums and tensor products. Some of the results are: (1) a slightly more general version of the fact that c_0 -sums of c_0 -saturated spaces are c_0 -saturated; (2) $C(K, E)$ is c_0 -saturated if both $C(K)$ and E are; (3) the tensor product $JH\tilde{\otimes}_\epsilon JH$ is c_0 -saturated, where JH is the James Hagler space.

Let E be a Banach space. Following Rosenthal [10], we say that a Banach space F is E -saturated if every infinite dimensional closed subspace of F contains an isomorphic copy of E . In this article, we will be concerned with the stability properties of c_0 -saturated spaces under the formation of direct sums and tensor products. In §1, we prove a result which implies that c_0 -sums of c_0 -saturated spaces are c_0 -saturated. In §2, it is shown that the tensor product $E\tilde{\otimes}_\epsilon F$ is c_0 -saturated if E is isomorphically polyhedral (see §2 for the definition) and F is c_0 -saturated. As a corollary, we obtain that $C(K, E)$ is c_0 -saturated if and only if both $C(K)$ and E are. Finally, in §3, we show that $JH\tilde{\otimes}_\epsilon JH$ is c_0 -saturated, where JH denotes the James Hagler space [4].

Standard Banach space terminology, as may be found in [7], is employed. The (closed) unit ball of a Banach space E is denoted by U_E . The space c_{00} consists of all finitely non-zero real sequences. If (x_n) and (y_n) are sequences residing in possibly different Banach spaces, we say that (x_n) *dominates* (y_n) if there is a constant $K < \infty$ such that $\|\sum a_n y_n\| \leq K \|\sum a_n x_n\|$ for all $(a_n) \in c_{00}$. Two sequences which dominate each other are said to be *equivalent*. A sequence (x_n) in a Banach space is *semi-normalized* if $0 < \inf \|x_n\| \leq \sup \|x_n\| < \infty$. If A is an arbitrary set, $|A|$ denotes the cardinality of A . For an infinite set A , $\mathcal{P}_\infty(A)$ is the set of all infinite subsets of A .

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification* 46B20, 46B28.

1 Direct sums of c_0 -saturated spaces

In [10], it is stated without proof that c_0 -sums of c_0 -saturated spaces are c_0 -saturated. In this section, we prove a result which includes this as a special case. Let (E_n) be a sequence of Banach spaces, and let F be a Banach space with a basis (e_n) . The F -sum of the spaces E_n is the Banach space $(\oplus E_n)_F$ of all sequences $(x(n))$ such that $x(n) \in E_n$ for all n , and $\sum \|x(n)\|e_n$ converges in F , endowed with the norm

$$\|(x(n))\| = \left\| \sum \|x(n)\|e_n \right\|.$$

For convenience, we will say that a Banach space is p -saturated if it is ℓ^p -saturated ($1 \leq p < \infty$) or c_0 -saturated ($p = \infty$).

Lemma 1 *Let E, F be p -saturated Banach spaces for some $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, then $E \oplus F$ is p -saturated.*

Proof: It suffices to show that every normalized basic sequence in $E \oplus F$ has a block basis equivalent to the ℓ^p -basis (c_0 -basis if $p = \infty$). Let $(x_n \oplus y_n)$ be a normalized basic sequence in $E \oplus F$. If $p = 1$, and $(x_n \oplus y_n)$ has a ℓ^1 -subsequence, then we are done. Otherwise, by Rosenthal's Theorem [8], we may assume that $(x_n \oplus y_n)$ is weakly Cauchy. If $p \neq 1$, using again Rosenthal's Theorem, we may assume that both (x_n) and (y_n) are weakly Cauchy. In both cases, by replacing the sequence $(x_n \oplus y_n)$ with $(x_{2n-1} - x_{2n} \oplus y_{2n-1} - y_{2n})$ if necessary, we may even assume that both (x_n) and (y_n) are weakly null. If $\|y_n\| \rightarrow 0$, then a subsequence of $(x_n \oplus y_n)$ is equivalent to a subsequence of $(x_n \oplus 0)$. But then the latter is a basic sequence in E , and hence has a block basis equivalent to the ℓ^p -basis. Therefore, $(x_n \oplus y_n)$ has a ℓ^p -block basis as well. A similar argument holds if $\|x_n\| \rightarrow 0$. Otherwise, we may take both (x_n) and (y_n) to be semi-normalized weakly null sequences. By using a subsequence, it may be assumed that both are basic sequences. Then (x_n) has a ℓ^p -block basis $(u_k) = (\sum_{j=n_k+1}^{n_{k+1}} a_j x_j)$. Let $(v_k) = (\sum_{j=n_k+1}^{n_{k+1}} a_j y_j)$ be the corresponding block basis of (y_n) . If $\|v_k\| \rightarrow 0$, then we apply the same argument as above. If $\|v_k\| \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\left(\frac{u_k}{\|v_k\|} \oplus \frac{v_k}{\|v_k\|} \right)$$

is a semi-normalized block basis of $(x_n \oplus y_n)$. Since $\|u_k\|/\|v_k\| \rightarrow 0$, we may apply the argument above yet again to conclude the proof. Finally, then, we may assume that (v_k) is semi-normalized. Then (v_k) has a ℓ^p -block basis (t_k) . Let (s_k) be the

corresponding block basis of (u_k) formed by using the same coefficients. Arguing as before, we may assume that (s_k) is semi-normalized. But since (u_k) is a ℓ^p -sequence, so is (s_k) . Therefore, $(s_k \oplus t_k)$ is a ℓ^p -block basis of $(u_k \oplus v_k)$, and hence of $(x_n \oplus y_n)$. ■

Theorem 2 *Let (E_n) be a sequence of p -saturated Banach spaces, and let F be a p -saturated Banach space with a basis. Then $E = (\oplus E_n)_F$ is p -saturated.*

Proof: For each $x \in E$, write $x = (x(n))$, where $x(n) \in E_n$ for all n . Let (x_k) be a normalized basic sequence in E . For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let P_m be the projection on E defined by $P_m x = y$, where $y(n) = x(n)$ if $n \leq m$, and $y(n) = 0$ otherwise. If for some subsequence (z_j) of (x_k) , and some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $(P_m z_j)_j$ dominates (z_j) , then (z_j) is equivalent to $(P_m z_j)_j$. But then the latter is a basic sequence in $E_1 \oplus \dots \oplus E_m$, which is p -saturated by Lemma 1 and induction. Hence (z_j) , and thus (x_k) , has a ℓ^p -block basis, and we are done. Otherwise, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and every subsequence (z_j) of (x_k) ,

$$\inf \left\{ \left\| \sum_j a_j P_m z_j \right\| : (a_j) \in c_{00}, \left\| \sum a_j z_j \right\| = 1 \right\} = 0. \quad (1)$$

Let $m_0 = 0$, and $y_1 = x_1$. Choose m_1 such that $\|(1 - P_{m_1})y_1\| \leq 1$. By (1), there exists $k_2 \geq 2$, and $y_2 \in \text{span}\{x_k : 2 \leq k \leq k_2\}$, $\|y_2\| = 1$, such that $\|P_{m_1} y_2\| \leq 1/4$. Then choose $m_2 > m_1$ so that $\|(1 - P_{m_2})y_2\| \leq 1/4$. Continuing inductively, we obtain a normalized block basis (y_j) of (x_k) , and $(m_j)_{j=0}^\infty$ such that

$$\|y_j - (P_{m_j} - P_{m_{j-1}})y_j\| \leq 1/j$$

for all $j \geq 1$ ($P_0 = 0$). Let $v_j = (P_{m_j} - P_{m_{j-1}})y_j$. Then (y_j) has a subsequence equivalent to a subsequence of (v_j) . But, writing the basis of F as (e_n) , it is clear that (v_j) is equivalent to the sequence $(\sum_{n=m_{j-1}+1}^{m_j} \|v_j(n)\| e_n)$ in F . Since F is p -saturated, we conclude that any subsequence of (v_j) has a ℓ^p -block basis. Thus, the same can be said of (x_k) , and the proof is complete. ■

2 Tensor products of c_0 -saturated spaces

For Banach spaces E and F , let $K_{w*}(E', F)$ denote the space of all compact weak*-weakly continuous operators from E' into F , endowed with the operator norm. The ϵ -tensor product $E \tilde{\otimes}_\epsilon F$ is the closure in $K_{w*}(E', F)$ of the finite rank operators that

belong to $K_{w*}(E', F)$. These spaces are equal if either E or F has the approximation property [11]. In this section and the next, we investigate special cases of the following:

Problem: Is $K_{w*}(E', F)$ (or $E \tilde{\otimes}_\epsilon F$) c_0 -saturated if both E and F are?

A Banach space is *polyhedral* if the unit ball of every finite dimensional subspace is a polyhedron. It is *isomorphically polyhedral* if it is isomorphic to a polyhedral Banach space. Our interest in isomorphically polyhedral spaces arises from the following result of Fonf [2].

Theorem 3 (Fonf) *An isomorphically polyhedral Banach space is c_0 -saturated.*

A subset W of the dual of a Banach space E is said to be *isomorphically precisely norming* (i.p.n.) if W is bounded and

- (a) there exists $K < \infty$ such that $\|x\| \leq K \sup_{w \in W} |w(x)|$ for all $x \in E$,
- (b) the supremum $\sup_{w \in W} |w(x)|$ is attained at some $w_0 \in W$ for all $x \in E$.

This terminology was introduced by Rosenthal [9, 10] to provide a succinct formulation of the following result of Fonf [3].

Theorem 4 (Fonf) *A separable Banach space E is isomorphically polyhedral if and only if E' contains a countable i.p.n. subset.*

In this section, we consider the space $K_{w*}(E', F)$ when one of the spaces E or F is isomorphically polyhedral, and the other is c_0 -saturated. Note the symmetry in the situation as $K_{w*}(E', F)$ is isometric to $K_{w*}(F', E)$ via the mapping $T \mapsto T'$. For Lemma 5, note that if $x' \in E'$ and $y' \in F'$, the pair (x', y') defines a functional on $K_{w*}(E', F)$ by $T \mapsto \langle Tx', y' \rangle$.

Lemma 5 *Let E, F be Banach spaces, and let W and V be i.p.n. subsets of E' and F' respectively. Then $W \times V$ is an i.p.n. subset of $(K_{w*}(E', F))'$.*

Proof: It is clear that if both W and V satisfy (a) of the definition of an i.p.n. set with constant K , then $W \times V$ also satisfies it with constant K^2 . Now assume that both W and V satisfy part (b) of the definition. It is easy to see that $(x', y') \mapsto \langle Tx', y' \rangle$ is a continuous function on $\overline{W}^{w*} \times \overline{V}^{w*}$, where both $\overline{W}^{w*}$ and $\overline{V}^{w*}$ are given their respective weak* topologies. Since $\overline{W}^{w*} \times \overline{V}^{w*}$ is compact, there exists $(w_0, v_0) \in \overline{W}^{w*} \times \overline{V}^{w*}$ such that

$$\sup_{(x', y') \in W \times V} |\langle Tx', y' \rangle| = \sup_{(x', y') \in \overline{W}^{w*} \times \overline{V}^{w*}} |\langle Tx', y' \rangle| = |\langle Tw_0, v_0 \rangle|.$$

Now there exists $v \in V$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle Tw_0, v \rangle| &= \sup_{y' \in V} |\langle Tw_0, y' \rangle| \\ &= \sup_{y' \in \overline{V}^{w*}} |\langle Tw_0, y' \rangle| \\ &\geq |\langle Tw_0, v_0 \rangle|. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, there exists $w \in W$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle Tw, v \rangle| &= |\langle w, T'v \rangle| \\ &= \sup_{x' \in W} |\langle x', T'v \rangle| \\ &= \sup_{x' \in \overline{W}^{w*}} |\langle x', T'v \rangle| \\ &\geq |\langle Tw_0, v \rangle|. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above, we see that $|\langle Tw, v \rangle| \geq \sup_{(x', y') \in W \times V} |\langle Tx', y' \rangle|$. Since the reverse inequality is obvious, the proof is complete. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 6 *Let (x_n) be a non-convergent sequence in a c_0 -saturated Banach space F . There exists a normalized block $(u_k) = (\sum_{n=n_{k-1}+1}^{n_k} b_n x_n)$ of (x_n) which is equivalent to the c_0 -basis.*

Proof: Going to a subsequence, we may assume that $\inf_{m \neq n} \|x_m - x_n\| > 0$. By Rosenthal's Theorem [8], we may also assume that (x_n) is weakly Cauchy. Let $y_n = (x_{2n-1} - x_{2n}) / \|x_{2n-1} - x_{2n}\|$ for all n . Then (y_n) is a weakly null normalized block of (x_n) . Without loss of generality, we may assume that (y_n) is a basic sequence. Since F is c_0 -saturated, (y_n) has a normalized block basis (u_k) equivalent to the c_0 -basis. As (u_k) is also a normalized block of (x_n) , the proof is complete. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 7 *Let E, F be Banach spaces so that F is c_0 -saturated, and let (T_n) be a normalized basic sequence in $K_{w*}(E', F)$. For every $x' \in E'$, there is a normalized block basis (S_n) of (T_n) , and a constant C , such that*

$$\left\| \sum a_n S_n x' \right\| \leq C \sup_n |a_n|$$

for all $(a_n) \in c_{00}$.

Proof: There is no loss of generality in assuming that $\|x'\| = 1$.

Case 1 $(T_n x')$ converges.

We may assume without loss of generality that $\|(T_{2n-1} - T_{2n})x'\| \leq 2^{-n}$ for all n . Let $\epsilon_n = \|T_{2n-1} - T_{2n}\|$. Since (T_n) is a normalized basic sequence, $\epsilon \equiv \inf_n \epsilon_n > 0$. Now let $S_n = \epsilon_n^{-1}(T_{2n-1} - T_{2n})$ for all n . Then (S_n) is a normalized block basis of (T_n) . Furthermore, for any $(a_n) \in c_{00}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum a_n S_n x' \right\| &\leq \epsilon^{-1} \sup_n |a_n| \sum \| (T_{2n-1} - T_{2n}) x' \| \\ &\leq \epsilon^{-1} \sup_n |a_n|. \end{aligned}$$

Case 2 $(T_n x')$ does not converge.

By Lemma 6, $(T_n x')$ has a normalized block $(u_k) = (\sum_{n=n_{k-1}+1}^{n_k} b_n T_n x')$ which is equivalent to the c_0 -basis. Let $R_k = (\sum_{n=n_{k-1}+1}^{n_k} b_n T_n)$. Then $\|R_k\| \geq \|R_k x'\| = \|u_k\| = 1$. Let $S_k = R_k / \|R_k\|$ for all k . Then (S_k) is a normalized block basis of (T_n) , and

$$\left\| \sum a_k S_k x' \right\| = \left\| \sum \frac{a_k}{\|R_k\|} u_k \right\| \leq C \sup_k |a_k|$$

for all $(a_k) \in c_{00}$, since (u_k) is equivalent to the c_0 -basis and $\|R_k\| \geq 1$. ■

Theorem 8 *Let E, F be Banach spaces so that E is isomorphically polyhedral and F is c_0 -saturated. Then $K_{w*}(E', F)$ is c_0 -saturated.*

Proof: Let (T_n) be a normalized basic sequence in $K_{w*}(E', F)$. It is easily seen that $G = [\cup T'_n F']$ is a separable subspace of E , and that the sequences (T_n) and $(T_n|_G)$ are equivalent. Thus we may assume that E is separable. Then E' contains a countable i.p.n. subset W . Write $W = (w_m)$. By Lemma 7, $(T_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ has a normalized block basis $(T_n^{(1)})$ such that

$$\left\| \sum a_n T_n^{(1)} w_1 \right\| \leq C_1 \sup_n |a_n|$$

for some constant C_1 for all $(a_n) \in c_{00}$. Inductively, if $(T_n^{(m)})$ has been chosen, let $(T_n^{(m+1)})$ be a normalized block basis of $(T_n^{(m)})_{n=2}^\infty$ such that there is a constant C_{m+1} satisfying

$$\left\| \sum a_n T_n^{(m+1)} w_{m+1} \right\| \leq C_{m+1} \sup_n |a_n|$$

for all $(a_n) \in c_{00}$. Now let $S_m = T_1^{(m)}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then (S_m) is a normalized block basis of (T_n) . Also, for all k , $(S_m)_{m=k}^\infty$ is a block basis of $(T_n^{(k)})$. Fix k , and write $S_m = \sum_{n=j_{m-1}+1}^{j_m} b_n T_n^{(k)}$ for all $m \geq k$. Since (S_m) is normalized, and $(T_n^{(k)})$ is normalized basic, (b_i) is bounded. Therefore, by the choice of $(T_n^{(k)})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{m=k}^\infty a_m S_m w_k \right\| &= \left\| \sum_{m=k}^\infty a_m \left(\sum_{n=j_{m-1}+1}^{j_m} b_n T_n^{(k)} w_k \right) \right\| \\ &\leq C_k \sup_{m \geq k} \sup_{j_{m-1} < n \leq j_m} |a_m b_n| \\ &\leq C_k \sup_n |b_n| \sup_{m \geq k} |a_m| \end{aligned}$$

for all $(a_m) \in c_{00}$. Consequently, $\sum_{m=1}^\infty a_m S_m w_k$ converges in F for all k and all $(a_m) \in c_0$. Hence $\sum |\langle S_m w, y' \rangle| < \infty$ for all $(w, y') \in W \times U_{F'}$. But by Lemma 5, $W \times U_{F'}$ is an i.p.n. subset of $K_{w*}(E', F)$. Applying Elton's extremal criterion ([1], see also [10, Theorem 18]), we see that $[S_m]$ contains a copy of c_0 . $\blacksquare$

Recall that a subset A of topological space X is *dense-in-itself* if every point of A is an accumulation point of A . A is *scattered* if it contains no non-empty dense-in-itself subset.

Corollary 9 *Let K be a compact Hausdorff space, and let E be a Banach space. Then $C(K, E)$ is c_0 -saturated if and only if both $C(K)$ and E are c_0 -saturated.*

Proof: The “only if” part is clear, since both $C(K)$ and E embed in $C(K, E)$. Now assume that both $C(K)$ and E are c_0 -saturated. To begin with, assume additionally that $C(K)$ is separable. Then K is metrizable [12, Proposition II.7.5]. If K is not scattered, by [13, Theorem 8.5.4], there is a continuous surjection ϕ of K onto $[0, 1]$. Then $f \mapsto f \circ \phi$ is an isometric embedding of $C[0, 1]$ into $C(K)$. This contradicts the fact that $C(K)$ is c_0 -saturated. Thus K is scattered. By [13, Theorem 8.6.10], K is homeomorphic to a countable compact ordinal. In particular, K is countable. Hence $C(K)'$ contains a countable i.p.n. subset, namely, $\{\delta_k : k \in K\}$, where δ_k denotes the Dirac measure concentrated at k . Therefore, $C(K)$ is isomorphically polyhedral, and $C(K, E) = K_{w*}(C(K)', E)$ is c_0 -saturated by Theorem 8.

If $C(K)$ is non-separable, as in the proof of the theorem, it suffices to show that $K_{w*}(G', E)$ contains a copy of c_0 for an arbitrary separable closed subspace G of $C(K)$. However, $K_{w*}(G', E)$ is isometric to $K_{w*}(E', G)$, which clearly embeds in $K_{w*}(E', F)$

for any closed subspace F of $C(K)$ containing G . Take F to be the closed sublattice generated by G and the constant 1 function. By Kakutani's Representation Theorem [12, Theorem II.7.4], F is lattice isometric to some $C(H)$. Note that $C(H)$ is separable since F is. Therefore, $K_{w*}(E', F)$, which is isometric to $K_{w*}(F', E) = C(H, E)$, is c_0 -saturated by the above. Since $K_{w*}(G', E)$ is isomorphic to a subspace of $K_{w*}(E', F)$, it contains a copy of c_0 . $\blacksquare$

3 The space $JH \tilde{\otimes}_\epsilon JH$

In view of Theorem 8 in §2, it is interesting to consider spaces $K_{w*}(E', F)$ where both E and F are c_0 -saturated, but neither is isomorphically polyhedral. In this section, we investigate one such case. Namely, when $E = F = JH$, the James Hagler space. In [6], it was shown that $JH \tilde{\otimes}_\epsilon JH = K_{w*}(JH', JH)$ does not contain an isomorph of ℓ^1 . We show here that, in fact, $JH \tilde{\otimes}_\epsilon JH$ is c_0 -saturated. The proof uses Elton's extremal criterion for weak unconditional convergence, and the "diagonalization technique" employed by Hagler to show that every normalized weakly null sequence in JH has a c_0 -subsequence.

Let us recall the definition of the space JH , as well as fix some terms and notation. Let $T = \cup_{n=0}^\infty \{0, 1\}^n$ be the dyadic tree. The elements of T are called *nodes*. If ϕ is a node of the form $(\epsilon_i)_{i=1}^n$, we say that ϕ has *length* n and write $|\phi| = n$. The length of the empty node is defined to be 0. For $\phi, \psi \in T$ with $\phi = (\epsilon_i)_{i=1}^n$ and $\psi = (\delta_i)_{i=1}^m$, we say that $\phi \leq \psi$ if $n \leq m$ and $\epsilon_i = \delta_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. The empty node is $\leq \phi$ for all $\phi \in T$. We write $\phi < \psi$ if $\phi \leq \psi$ and $\phi \neq \psi$. Two nodes ϕ and ψ are *incomparable* if neither $\phi \leq \psi$ nor $\psi \leq \phi$ hold. If $\phi \leq \psi$, we say that ϕ is an *ancestor* of ψ , while ψ is a *descendant* of ϕ . For any $\phi \in T$, let Δ_ϕ be the set of all descendants of ϕ . If $\phi \leq \psi$, let

$$S(\phi, \psi) = \{\xi : \phi \leq \xi \leq \psi\}.$$

A set of the form $S(\phi, \psi)$ is called a *segment*, or more specifically, a *m-n segment* provided $|\phi| = m$, and $|\psi| = n$. A *branch* is a maximal totally ordered subset of T . The set of all branches is denoted by Γ . A branch γ (respectively, a segment S) is said to *pass through* a node ϕ if $\phi \in \gamma$ (respectively, $\phi \in S$). If $x : T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a finitely supported function and S is a segment, we define (with slight abuse of notation) $Sx = \sum_{\phi \in S} x(\phi)$. Similarly, if $\gamma \in \Gamma$, we define $\gamma(x) = \sum_{\phi \in \gamma} x(\phi)$. A set of segments $\{S_1, \dots, S_r\}$ is *admissible* if they are pairwise disjoint, and there are $m, n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ such that each S_i is a *m-n segment*. The James Hagler space JH is defined as the

completion of the set of all finitely supported functions $x : T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ under the norm:

$$\|x\| = \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^r |S_i x| : S_1, \dots, S_r \text{ is an admissible set of segments} \right\}.$$

Clearly, all S and γ extend to norm 1 functionals on JH . Finally, if $x : T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is finitely supported, and $n \geq 0$, let $P_n x : T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$(P_n x)(\phi) = \begin{cases} x(\phi) & \text{if } |\phi| \geq n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Obviously, P_n extends uniquely to a norm 1 projection on JH , which we denote again by P_n .

We begin with some lemmas on “node management”. Let ϕ and ψ be nodes. Denote by $A(\phi, \psi)$ the unique node of maximal length such that $A(\phi, \psi) \leq \phi$ and $A(\phi, \psi) \leq \psi$. A sequence of nodes (ϕ_n) is a *strongly incomparable sequence* if

- (a) ϕ_n and ϕ_m are incomparable if $n \neq m$,
- (b) no family of admissible segments passes through more than two of the ϕ_n ’s.

The first lemma is due to Hagler [4, Lemma 2].

Lemma 10 (Hagler) *Let (ϕ_n) be a sequence of nodes with strictly increasing lengths. Then there exists $N \in \mathcal{P}_\infty(\mathbb{N})$ such that either $(\phi_n)_{n \in N}$ determines a unique branch of T , or $(\phi_n)_{n \in N}$ is a strongly incomparable sequence.*

Lemma 11 *Let $(\phi(n))$ be a strongly incomparable sequence of nodes such that $|\phi(n)| < |\phi(n+1)|$ for all n . Then for all $m \geq n \geq 1$, $\phi(m) \in \Delta_{A(\phi(n), \phi(n+1))}$.*

Proof: Otherwise, there exist $m \geq n \geq 1$ such that $\phi(m) \notin \Delta_{A(\phi(n), \phi(n+1))}$. In particular, note that $m \geq n+2$. Let $\phi_1 = \phi(n)$, and let ϕ_2 and ϕ_3 be the ancestors of $\phi(n+1)$ and $\phi(m)$ respectively of length $|\phi(n)|$. Then $\phi_1 \neq \phi_2$ since $\phi(n)$ and $\phi(n+1)$ are incomparable. Also $\phi_1 \neq \phi_3$ and $\phi_2 \neq \phi_3$ since $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \Delta_{A(\phi(n), \phi(n+1))}$, while $\phi_3 \notin \Delta_{A(\phi(n), \phi(n+1))}$. Let ψ_1, ψ_2 be nodes of length $|\phi(m)|$ which are $\geq \phi(n)$ and $\phi(n+1)$ respectively, and let $\psi_3 = \phi(m)$. Then $\{S(\phi_i, \psi_i) : i = 1, 2, 3\}$ is an admissible set of segments. However, $\phi(n) \in S(\phi_1, \psi_1)$, $\phi(n+1) \in S(\phi_2, \psi_2)$, and $\phi(m) \in S(\phi_3, \psi_3)$, violating the strong incomparability of $(\phi(k))$. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 12 *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $(\phi(i, j))_{i=1}^\infty$ be a strongly incomparable sequence of nodes for $1 \leq j \leq m$. Assume that $|\phi(i, j)| = |\phi(i, j')| < |\phi(i+1, j)|$ whenever $i, j, j' \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 \leq j, j' \leq m$, and that for each i , $\{\phi(i, j) : 1 \leq j \leq m\}$ are pairwise distinct. Then there exists k_0 such that $\{\phi(i, j) : i \geq k_0, 1 \leq j \leq m\}$ are pairwise incomparable.*

Proof: Induct on m . If $m = 1$, there is nothing to prove. Now assume that the statement is true for $m - 1$ ($m \geq 2$). Let $\{\phi(i, j) : i \geq 1, 1 \leq j \leq m\}$ be as given. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\{\phi(i, j) : i \geq 1, 1 \leq j \leq m - 1\}$ are pairwise incomparable. First observe that if $\phi(i_1, j_1) < \phi(i_2, j_2)$ for some $j_1, j_2 \leq m$, then $A(\phi(i_2, j_2), \phi(i_2 + 1, j_2)) \geq \phi(i_1, j_1)$. Indeed, since $A(\phi(i_2, j_2), \phi(i_2 + 1, j_2))$ and $\phi(i_1, j_1)$ share the same descendant $\phi(i_2, j_2)$, they are comparable. Hence if the claim fails, $A(\phi(i_2, j_2), \phi(i_2 + 1, j_2)) < \phi(i_1, j_1)$. But then the ancestor of $\phi(i_2 + 1, j_2)$ of length $|\phi(i_1, j_1)|$, $\phi(i_1, j_1)$, and $\phi(i_1, j_2)$, are distinct. From this it is easy to construct an admissible set of segments which pass through all three nodes $\{\phi(i_1, j_2), \phi(i_2, j_2), \phi(i_2 + 1, j_2)\}$, in violation of their strong incomparability. This proves the claim. In particular, under the circumstances, Lemma 11 implies $\phi(i, j_2) \in \Delta_{\phi(i_1, j_1)}$ for all $i \geq i_2$. The remainder of the proof is divided into two cases.

Case 1 There exist $j_1 < m$ and $i_1, i_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\phi(i_1, j_1) \leq \phi(i_2, m)$.

Note that since $\{\phi(i_1, j) : j \leq m\}$ are pairwise distinct, we must have $\phi(i_1, j_1) < \phi(i_2, m)$. By the observation above, we obtain that $\phi(i, m) \in \Delta_{\phi(i_1, j_1)}$ for all $i \geq i_2$. However, for any $i' \geq i_2, j < m$, $\phi(i', j)$ is incomparable with $\phi(i_1, j_1)$ by induction. Hence $\phi(i', j) \notin \Delta_{\phi(i_1, j_1)}$. Thus $\phi(i, m)$ and $\phi(i', j)$ are incomparable whenever $i, i' \geq i_2$ and $j < m$. This is enough to show that $\{\phi(i, j) : i \geq i_2, 1 \leq j \leq m\}$ are pairwise incomparable.

Case 2 For all $j_1 < m$ and $i_1, i_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, $\phi(i_1, j_1) \not\leq \phi(i_2, m)$.

Let $I = \{i : \text{there exist } i' \in \mathbb{N}, j < m \text{ such that } \phi(i, m) < \phi(i', j)\}$. Let i_1 and i_2 be distinct elements of I . Choose $i'_1, i'_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, $j_1, j_2 < m$ such that $\phi(i_k, m) < \phi(i'_k, j_k)$, $k = 1, 2$. By the observation above, $\phi(i, j_k) \in \Delta_{\phi(i_k, m)}$ for all $i \geq i'_k$, $k = 1, 2$. Now $\phi(i_1, m)$ and $\phi(i_2, m)$ are incomparable by assumption. Therefore, $\Delta_{\phi(i_1, m)} \cap \Delta_{\phi(i_2, m)} = \emptyset$. Combined with the above, we see that $j_1 \neq j_2$. It follows that $|I| \leq m - 1$. Now choose k_0 such that $i < k_0$ for all $i \in I$. By the case assumption, $\phi(i, m)$ is incomparable with $\phi(i', j)$ whenever $i \geq k_0$ and $j < m$. This is enough to show that $\{\phi(i, j) : i \geq k_0, 1 \leq j \leq m\}$ are pairwise incomparable. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 13 *Let (x_n) be a bounded weakly null sequence in JH so that there is a sequence $0 = j_1 < j_2 < j_3 < \dots$ with $x_n \in (P_{j_n} - P_{j_{n+1}})JH$ for all n . Assume that $\sup_{\xi \in \Gamma} |\langle x_n, \xi \rangle| \leq \epsilon$ for all n . Then there is a subsequence (x_{n_k}) such that*

$$\sup_{\xi \in \Gamma} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\langle x_{n_k}, \xi \rangle| \leq 7\epsilon.$$

Proof: For $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$F(n, m) = \{\phi \in \{0, 1\}^{j_n} : \text{there exists at least one branch } \xi \text{ through } \phi \text{ with } |\langle x_n, \xi \rangle| > \epsilon/2^m, \text{ and for all branches } \xi \text{ through } \phi, |\langle x_n, \xi \rangle| \leq \epsilon/2^{m-1}\}.$$

Since (x_n) is bounded, $\sup_n |F(n, m)| < \infty$ for all m . Let $N_1 \in \mathcal{P}_\infty(\mathbb{N})$ be such that $(|F(n, 1)|)_{n \in N_1}$ is constant, say, b_1 . Write $F(n, 1) = \{\phi(n, 1, i) : 1 \leq i \leq b_1\}$ for all $n \in N_1$. Choose $N'_1 \in \mathcal{P}_\infty(N_1)$ so that for $1 \leq i \leq b_1$, $(\phi(n, 1, i))_{n \in N'_1}$ is either a strongly incomparable sequence or determines a branch. Let

$$I_1 = \{i \leq b_1 : (\phi(n, 1, i))_{n \in N'_1} \text{ determines a branch}\},$$

and let Γ_1 be the set of branches determined by some $(\phi(n, 1, i))_{n \in N'_1}$ for some $i \in I_1$. Let $L_1 = \{1, \dots, b_1\} \setminus I_1$. By Lemma 12, there exists $N''_1 \in \mathcal{P}_\infty(N'_1)$ such that $\{\phi(n, 1, i) : n \in N''_1, i \in L_1\}$ are pairwise incomparable. Finally, since Γ_1 is finite, there exists $n_1 \in N''_1$ such that $|\langle x_{n_1}, \gamma \rangle| \leq \epsilon/2$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma_1$. Continue inductively to obtain $n_1 < n_2 < \dots$, numbers $b_1, b_2, \dots$, and sets $I_1, I_2, \dots$, $L_1, L_2, \dots$, and $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \dots$ so that

1. for all $k \geq m$, $|F(n_k, m)| = b_m$,
2. for all $k \geq m$, $F(n_k, m) = \{\phi(n_k, m, i) : i \leq b_m\}$, where $(\phi(n_k, m, i))_{k=m}^\infty$ determines a branch if $i \in I_m$, and is a strongly incomparable sequence if $i \in L_m = \{1, \dots, b_m\} \setminus I_m$,
3. for all m , Γ_m is the set of branches determined by $(\phi(n_k, m, i))_{k=m}^\infty$ for some $i \in I_m$,
4. for all m , $\{\phi(n_k, m, i) : m \leq k, i \in L_m\}$ are pairwise incomparable,
5. for all k , $|\langle x_{n_k}, \gamma \rangle| \leq \epsilon/2^k$ for every $\gamma \in \Gamma_1 \cup \dots \cup \Gamma_k$.

For all k , let $G(k) = \{0, 1\}^{j_{n_k}} \setminus \cup_{m=1}^k F(n_k, m)$. Then $\{F(n_k, 1), \dots, F(n_k, k), G(k)\}$ is a partition of $\{0, 1\}^{j_{n_k}}$ for each k . Fix $\xi \in \Gamma$. Say $\xi = (\phi_n)_{n=0}^\infty$, where $|\phi_n| = n$ for all $n \geq 0$. Now let $J_0 = \{k : \phi_{n_k} \in G(k)\}$, and let $J_m = \{k \geq m : \phi_{n_k} \in F(n_k, m)\}$ for all $m \geq 1$. Then $(J_m)_{m=0}^\infty$ is a partition of $\mathbb{N}$. For all k such that $k \in J_m$ for some $m \geq 1$, choose i_k such that $\phi_{n_k} = \phi(n_k, m, i_k)$. For all $m \geq 1$, let $J_{m,1} = \{k \in J_m : i_k \in I_m\}$, and let $J_{m,2} = \{k \in J_m : i_k \in L_m\}$. Fix $m \geq 1$ such that $J_{m,1} \neq \emptyset$.

Case 1 $J_{m,1}$ is infinite.

In this case, there exists $\gamma \in \Gamma_m$ such that $\gamma = \xi$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \in J_{m,1}} |\langle x_{n_k}, \xi \rangle| &\leq \sum_{k=m}^\infty |\langle x_{n_k}, \xi \rangle| = \sum_{k=m}^\infty |\langle x_{n_k}, \gamma \rangle| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=m}^\infty \frac{\epsilon}{2^k} = \frac{\epsilon}{2^{m-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Case 2 $J_{m,1}$ is finite.

Let $k_0 = \max J_{m,1}$. There exists $\gamma \in \Gamma_m$ such that $\phi_{n_{k_0}} \in \gamma$. Then, since $\phi_{n_{k_0}} \in F(n_{k_0}, m)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \in J_{m,1}} |\langle x_{n_k}, \xi \rangle| &\leq \sum_{k=m}^{k_0} |\langle x_{n_k}, \xi \rangle| = \sum_{k=m}^{k_0-1} |\langle x_{n_k}, \gamma \rangle| + |\langle x_{n_{k_0}}, \xi \rangle| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=m}^\infty \frac{\epsilon}{2^k} + \frac{\epsilon}{2^{m-1}} = \frac{\epsilon}{2^{m-2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, in either case, we have

$$\sum_{k \in J_{m,1}} |\langle x_{n_k}, \xi \rangle| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2^{m-2}}. \quad (2)$$

Now suppose for some $m \geq 1$, there are distinct $k_1, k_2 \in J_{m,2}$. Then $k_1, k_2 \geq m$, and $\phi_{n_{k_1}} = \phi(n_{k_1}, m, i_{k_1})$, for some $i_{k_l} \in L_m$, $l = 1, 2$. But then by choice, $\phi_{n_{k_1}}$ and $\phi_{n_{k_2}}$ must be incomparable. This is a contradiction since they both belong to the branch ξ . Thus, for all $m \geq 1$, $|J_{m,2}| \leq 1$. Now $k \in J_{m,2}$ implies $\phi_{n_k} \in F(n_k, m)$, and hence $|\langle x_{n_k}, \xi \rangle| \leq \epsilon/2^{m-1}$. Consequently, for all $m \geq 1$

$$\sum_{k \in J_{m,2}} |\langle x_{n_k}, \xi \rangle| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2^{m-1}}. \quad (3)$$

Finally,

$$\sum_{k \in J_0} |\langle x_{n_k}, \xi \rangle| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\epsilon}{2^k} = \epsilon. \quad (4)$$

Combining inequalities (2)–(4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_k |\langle x_{n_k}, \xi \rangle| &\leq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k \in J_m} |\langle x_{n_k}, \xi \rangle| + \sum_{k \in J_0} |\langle x_{n_k}, \xi \rangle| \\ &\leq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{3\epsilon}{2^{m-1}} + \epsilon = 7\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

■

For $n \geq 0$, call a subset D of $\{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n$ *diagonal* if whenever $(\phi_1, \psi_1), (\phi_2, \psi_2)$ are distinct elements of D , then $\phi_1 \neq \phi_2$, and $\psi_1 \neq \psi_2$.

Lemma 14 *Let $n \geq 0$, $\epsilon > 0$, and let $T : JH' \rightarrow JH$ be normalized. Let*

$$\begin{aligned} A = \{ & (\phi, \psi) \in \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n : \text{there exists } \gamma, \xi \in \Gamma, \\ & \phi \in \gamma, \psi \in \xi, \text{ such that } |\langle TP'_n \gamma, P'_n \xi \rangle| > \epsilon \}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $|D| \leq 1/\epsilon$ for all diagonal subsets D of A .

Proof: Let $D = \{(\phi_i, \psi_i) : 1 \leq i \leq k\}$ be a diagonal subset of A . For each i , choose $\gamma_i, \xi_i \in \Gamma$ such that $\phi_i \in \gamma_i, \psi_i \in \xi_i$, and $|\langle TP'_n \gamma_i, P'_n \xi_i \rangle| > \epsilon$. Using the diagonality of D , we see that $(P'_n \gamma_i)_{i=1}^k$ and $(P'_n \xi_i)_{i=1}^k$ are both isometrically equivalent to the $\ell^\infty(n)$ -basis. For $1 \leq i, j \leq k$, let $a_{ij} = \langle TP'_n \gamma_i, P'_n \xi_j \rangle$. Define $S, R : \ell^\infty(k) \rightarrow \ell^1(k)$ by $S(b_1, \dots, b_k) = (\sum_{j=1}^k a_{ij} b_j)_{i=1}^k$ and $R(b_1, \dots, b_k) = (a_{ii} b_i)_{i=1}^k$ respectively. Then $\|S\| \leq \|T\| = 1$, and $\|R\| \geq k\epsilon$. However, by [7, Proposition 1.c.8], $\|R\| \leq \|S\|$. Therefore, $|D| = k \leq 1/\epsilon$. ■

Lemma 15 *Let (T_n) be a normalized weakly null sequence in $JH \tilde{\otimes}_\epsilon JH$ such that there is a sequence $0 = j_1 < j_2 < \dots$ with $(P_{j_n} - P_{j_{n+1}})T_n(P_{j_n} - P_{j_{n+1}})' = T_n$ for all n . Then there is a subsequence (T_{n_k}) such that*

$$\sum |\langle T_{n_k} \gamma, \xi \rangle| < \infty$$

for all $\gamma, \xi \in \Gamma$.

Proof: Note that $\|T_n\| = 1$ implies $|\langle T_n \gamma, \xi \rangle| \leq 1$ for all $\gamma, \xi \in \Gamma$. For all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$A(n, m) = \{(\phi, \psi) \in \{0, 1\}^{j_n} \times \{0, 1\}^{j_n} : \text{there exist branches } \gamma \text{ and } \xi \text{ through } \phi \text{ and } \psi \text{ respectively so that } |\langle T_n \gamma, \xi \rangle| > 1/2^m, \text{ and for all branches } \gamma \text{ and } \xi \text{ through } \phi \text{ and } \psi \text{ respectively, } |\langle T_n \gamma, \xi \rangle| \leq 1/2^{m-1}\}.$$

Fix n . Let $B(n, 1)$ be a maximal diagonal subset of $A(n, 1)$. Then let

$$C(n, 1) = \bigcup_{(\phi, \psi) \in B(n, 1)} \{(\phi_1, \psi_1) : \phi_1 = \phi \text{ or } \psi_1 = \psi\}.$$

Inductively, if $B(n, k)$ and $C(n, k)$ have been chosen for $k < m$, let $B(n, m)$ be a maximal diagonal subset of $A(n, m) \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{m-1} C(n, k)$. Then let

$$C(n, m) = \bigcup_{(\phi, \psi) \in B(n, m)} \{(\phi_1, \psi_1) : \phi_1 = \phi \text{ or } \psi_1 = \psi\}.$$

It is easily seen that

- (a) $\bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} B(n, m)$ is a diagonal subset of $\{0, 1\}^{j_n} \times \{0, 1\}^{j_n}$,
- (b) for all m , $B(n, m) \subseteq A(n, m) \cap C(n, m)$,
- (c) for all k , $\bigcup_{m=1}^k A(n, m) \subseteq \bigcup_{m=1}^k C(n, m)$.

In particular, by (b) and Lemma 14, $|B(n, m)| \leq 2^m$ for all m, n . Also, if $(\phi, \psi) \in \{0, 1\}^{j_n} \times \{0, 1\}^{j_n} \setminus \bigcup_{m=1}^k C(n, m)$, then (c) implies $(\phi, \psi) \notin \bigcup_{m=1}^k A(n, m)$. Hence if $\gamma, \xi \in \Gamma$ pass through ϕ and ψ respectively, then

$$|\langle T_n \gamma, \xi \rangle| \leq 1/2^k. \tag{5}$$

Now choose $N_1 \in \mathcal{P}_{\infty}(\mathbb{N})$ such that $|B(n, 1)|$ is a constant, say b_1 , for all $n \in N_1$. Write

$$B(n, 1) = \{(\phi(n, 1, i), \psi(n, 1, i)) : 1 \leq i \leq b_1\}$$

for all $n \in N_1$. There exists $N'_1 \in \mathcal{P}_{\infty}(N_1)$ such that for each $i \leq b_1$, $(\phi(n, 1, i))_{n \in N'_1}$ as well as $(\psi(n, 1, i))_{n \in N'_1}$ are either strongly incomparable or determine a branch. Let

$$I_1(\phi) = \{1 \leq i \leq b_1 : (\phi(n, 1, i))_{n \in N'_1} \text{ determines a branch.}\}$$

Let the set of branches so determined be denoted by $\Gamma_1(\phi)$. Define $I_1(\psi)$ and $\Gamma_1(\psi)$ similarly with regard to the sequence $(\psi(n, 1, i))_{n \in N'_1}$. Since (T_n) is weakly null, so are

$(T_n\gamma)$ and $(T'_n\xi)$ for all $\gamma, \xi \in \Gamma$. Thus, because both $\Gamma_1(\phi)$ and $\Gamma_1(\psi)$ are finite sets, Lemma 13 yields a set $N''_1 \in \mathcal{P}_\infty(N'_1)$ such that

$$\sup_{\xi \in \Gamma} \sum_{n \in N''_1} |\langle T_n\gamma, \xi \rangle| \leq 7 \quad \text{for all } \gamma \in \Gamma_1(\phi)$$

and

$$\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \sum_{n \in N''_1} |\langle \gamma, T'_n\xi \rangle| \leq 7 \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \Gamma_1(\psi).$$

Inductively, if $N''_m \in \mathcal{P}_\infty(N)$ has been chosen, let $N_{m+1} \in \mathcal{P}_\infty(N''_m)$ be such that $|B(n, m+1)|$ is a constant, say b_{m+1} , for all $n \in N_{m+1}$. For $n \in N_{m+1}$, list

$$B(n, m+1) = \{(\phi(n, m+1, i), \psi(n, m+1, i)) : 1 \leq i \leq b_{m+1}\},$$

choose $N'_{m+1} \in \mathcal{P}_\infty(N_{m+1})$ such that for each $i \leq b_{m+1}$, $(\phi(n, m+1, i))_{n \in N'_{m+1}}$ as well as $(\psi(n, m+1, i))_{n \in N'_{m+1}}$ are either strongly incomparable or determine a branch. Let

$$I_{m+1}(\phi) = \{1 \leq i \leq b_{m+1} : (\phi(n, m+1, i))_{n \in N'_{m+1}} \text{ determines a branch.}\}$$

Let the set of branches so determined be denoted by $\Gamma_{m+1}(\phi)$. Define $I_{m+1}(\psi)$ and $\Gamma_{m+1}(\psi)$ similarly with regard to the sequence $(\psi(n, m+1, i))_{n \in N'_{m+1}}$. If $\gamma \in \Gamma_{m+1}(\phi)$, $\xi \in \Gamma$, and $n \in N'_{m+1}$, let ϕ and ψ be the nodes of length j_n in γ and ξ respectively. Then $\phi = \phi(n, m+1, i)$ for some i . But $(\phi(n, m+1, i), \psi(n, m+1, i)) \in B(n, m+1)$. Therefore, $(\phi, \psi) \in C(n, m+1)$. In particular, $(\phi, \psi) \notin \cup_{k=1}^m C(n, k)$. By equation (5), $|\langle T_n\gamma, \xi \rangle| \leq 1/2^m$. Similarly, $|\langle \gamma, T'_n\xi \rangle| \leq 1/2^m$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $\xi \in \Gamma_{m+1}(\psi)$. By Lemma 13, there is a set $N''_{m+1} \in \mathcal{P}_\infty(N'_{m+1})$ such that

$$\sup_{\xi \in \Gamma} \sum_{n \in N''_{m+1}} |\langle T_n\gamma, \xi \rangle| \leq 7/2^m \quad \text{for all } \gamma \in \Gamma_{m+1}(\phi), \quad (6)$$

and

$$\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \sum_{n \in N''_{m+1}} |\langle \gamma, T'_n\xi \rangle| \leq 7/2^m \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \Gamma_{m+1}(\psi). \quad (7)$$

Pick $n_1 < n_2 < \dots$ such that $n_m \in N''_m$ for all m , and let

$$D(m) = \{0, 1\}^{j_{n_m}} \times \{0, 1\}^{j_{n_m}} \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^m C(n_m, k).$$

For all m , $\{C(n_m, 1), \dots, C(n_m, m), D(m)\}$ is a partition of $\{0, 1\}^{j_{n_m}} \times \{0, 1\}^{j_{n_m}}$. Fix $\gamma, \xi \in \Gamma$. We proceed to estimate $\sum_m |\langle T_{n_m}\gamma, \xi \rangle|$. For all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let ϕ_m and ψ_m be

the nodes of length j_{n_m} in γ and ξ respectively. Define $J_0 = \{m : (\phi_m, \psi_m) \in D(m)\}$, and $J_k = \{m \geq k : (\phi_m, \psi_m) \in C(n_m, k)\}$ for all $k \geq 1$. Note that $\{J_0, J_1, J_2, \dots\}$ is a partition of $\mathbb{N}$. If $m \in J_0$, then equation (5) yields $|\langle T_{n_m} \gamma, \xi \rangle| \leq 1/2^m$. Consequently,

$$\sum_{m \in J_0} |\langle T_{n_m} \gamma, \xi \rangle| \leq \sum_{m \in J_0} \frac{1}{2^m} \leq 1. \quad (8)$$

Now fix $k \geq 1$ and $m \in J_k$. Then $m \geq k$ and hence $n_m \in N_k$. Thus $B(n_m, k)$ is listed as $\{(\phi(n_m, k, i), \psi(n_m, k, i)) : 1 \leq i \leq b_k\}$. But $(\phi_m, \psi_m) \in C(n_m, k)$. Hence there exists $1 \leq i_m \leq b_k$ such that either $\phi_m = \phi(n_m, k, i_m)$ or $\psi_m = \psi(n_m, k, i_m)$. Let $J_k(\phi) = \{m \in J_k : \phi_m = \phi(n_m, k, i_m)\}$, and let $J_k(\psi) = J_k \setminus J_k(\phi)$. Since $n_m \in N'_k$ as well, we may further subdivide these sets into:

$$\begin{aligned} J_{k,1}(\phi) &= \{m \in J_k(\phi) : i_m \in I_k(\phi)\}, \\ J_{k,2}(\phi) &= J_k(\phi) \setminus J_{k,1}(\phi), \\ J_{k,1}(\psi) &= \{m \in J_k(\psi) : i_m \in I_k(\psi)\}, \\ J_{k,2}(\psi) &= J_k(\psi) \setminus J_{k,1}(\psi). \end{aligned}$$

Now $\{\phi(n_m, k, i_m) : m \in J_{k,2}(\phi)\}$ is a subset of the branch γ . But it is also contained in the union of the strongly incomparable sequences $(\phi(n, k, i))_{n \in N'_k}$, $i \notin I_k(\phi)$. Hence $|J_{k,2}(\phi)| \leq 2b_k$. Recalling equation (5), we obtain

$$\sum_{m \in J_{k,2}(\phi)} |\langle T_{n_m} \gamma, \xi \rangle| \leq \sum_{m \in J_{k,2}(\phi)} \frac{1}{2^{k-1}} \leq \frac{4b_k}{2^k}. \quad (9)$$

Similarly,

$$\sum_{m \in J_{k,2}(\psi)} |\langle T_{n_m} \gamma, \xi \rangle| \leq \frac{4b_k}{2^k}. \quad (10)$$

For any $m \in J_{k,1}(\phi)$, ϕ_m belongs to a branch in $\Gamma_k(\phi)$. Let $\tilde{\gamma}$ be a branch in $\Gamma_k(\phi)$ such that $M(\tilde{\gamma}) = \{m \in J_{k,1}(\phi) : \phi_m \in \tilde{\gamma}\}$ is non-empty. If $M(\tilde{\gamma})$ is finite, let m_0 be its maximal element. Then ϕ_{m_0} belongs to both branches $\tilde{\gamma}$ and γ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m \in M(\tilde{\gamma})} |\langle T_{n_m} \gamma, \xi \rangle| &= \sum_{m \in M(\tilde{\gamma}) \setminus \{m_0\}} |\langle T_{n_m} \tilde{\gamma}, \xi \rangle| + |\langle T_{n_{m_0}} \gamma, \xi \rangle| \\ &\leq \sup_{\xi \in \Gamma} \sum_{n \in N''_k} |\langle T_n \tilde{\gamma}, \xi \rangle| + |\langle T_{n_{m_0}} \gamma, \xi \rangle| \\ &\leq \frac{7}{2^{k-1}} + \frac{1}{2^{k-1}} = \frac{16}{2^k} \end{aligned}$$

by equations (6) and (5) respectively. On the other hand, if $M(\tilde{\gamma})$ is infinite, then $\tilde{\gamma}$ and γ coincide. Thus the term containing $T_{n_{m_0}}$ may simply be omitted from the above inequality. Now since $|\Gamma_k(\phi)| \leq b_k$, we obtain

$$\sum_{m \in J_{k,1}(\phi)} |\langle T_{n_m} \gamma, \xi \rangle| \leq \frac{16b_k}{2^k}. \quad (11)$$

Similarly,

$$\sum_{m \in J_{k,1}(\psi)} |\langle T_{n_m} \gamma, \xi \rangle| \leq \frac{16b_k}{2^k}. \quad (12)$$

Combining equations (8)–(12), we see that

$$\sum |\langle T_{n_m} \gamma, \xi \rangle| \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m \in J_k} |\langle T_{n_m} \gamma, \xi \rangle| \leq 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{40b_k}{2^k}.$$

To complete the proof, it remains to show that $\sum b_k/2^k < \infty$. Fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$. By property (a) of the sets $B(n, k)$, $\cup_{k=1}^m B(n_m, k)$ is a diagonal subset of $\{0, 1\}^{j_{n_m}} \times \{0, 1\}^{j_{n_m}}$. Hence $\{\phi(n_m, k, i) : i \leq b_k, k \leq m\}$ are all distinct, as are $\{\psi(n_m, k, i) : i \leq b_k, k \leq m\}$. By the definition of $B(n_m, k)$, one can choose, for any $i \leq b_k, k \leq m$, branches $\gamma_{k,i}$ and $\xi_{k,i}$, passing through $\phi(n_m, k, i)$ and $\psi(n_m, k, i)$ respectively, so that $|\langle T_{n_m} \gamma_{k,i}, \xi_{k,i} \rangle| > 1/2^k$. Keeping in mind the assumption on (T_n) , we see that this inequality remains valid if $\gamma_{k,i}$ and $\xi_{k,i}$ are replaced by $\delta_{k,i} = P'_{j_{n_m}} \gamma_{k,i}$ and $\zeta_{k,i} = P'_{j_{n_m}} \xi_{k,i}$ respectively. Since $(\delta_{k,i})$ and $(\zeta_{k,i})$ are isometrically equivalent to the $\ell^\infty(\sum_{k=1}^m b_k)$ -basis, the map $S : \ell^\infty(\sum_{k=1}^m b_k) \rightarrow \ell^1(\sum_{k=1}^m b_k)$

$$S(b_{k,i})_{i=1}^{b_k} = (\sum_{k,i} \langle T_{n_m} \delta_{k,i}, \zeta_{k',i'} \rangle b_{k,i})_{i'=1}^{b_{k'}} =$$

has norm $\leq \|T_{n_m}\| = 1$. Then [7, Proposition 1.c.8] implies that the “diagonal” of S also has norm ≤ 1 . But this means

$$\sum_{k=1}^m \frac{b_k}{2^k} \leq \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{i=1}^{b_k} |\langle T_{n_m} \delta_{k,i}, \zeta_{k',i'} \rangle| \leq 1.$$

Since m is arbitrary, $\sum b_k/2^k$ converges, as required. ■

In order to apply Elton’s extremal criterion, we need the following. For convenience, we call an element of JH' of the form $P'_m \gamma$, where $m \geq 0$, and $\gamma \in \Gamma$, a m - ∞ segment.

Lemma 16 *Let W be the collection of all elements in JH' of the form $\sum_{i=1}^r a_i S_i$, where $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $\max |a_i| \leq 1$, and there exist m, n , with n possibly equal to ∞ , so that $\{S_1, \dots, S_r\}$ is a set of pairwise disjoint m - n segments. Then W is an i.p.n. subset of JH' . Consequently, $W \times W$ is an i.p.n. subset of $JH \hat{\otimes}_\epsilon JH$.*

Proof: The second assertion follows from the first by Lemma 5. If $\sum_{i=1}^r a_i S_i \in W$, and $x \in JH$, then

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^r a_i S_i x \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^r |S_i x| \leq \|x\|.$$

To complete the proof, it suffices to show that for all $x \in JH$, there is a collection $\{S_1, \dots, S_r\}$ of disjoint m - n segments (n possibly $= \infty$) such that $\|x\| = \sum_{i=1}^r |S_i x|$. Let $x \in JH$ be fixed. For each j , choose an admissible collection of m_j - n_j segments A_j such that

$$\|x\| = \lim_j \sum_{S \in A_j} |Sx|. \quad (13)$$

If (m_j) is unbounded, $\sum_{S \in A_j} |Sx| \leq \|P_{m_j} x\| \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Hence $x = 0$, and the result is obvious. If (n_j) is bounded, then so is (m_j) . Without loss of generality, we may assume that both (m_j) and (n_j) are constant sequences with finite values, say, m and n . But as there are only finitely many sets of admissible m - n segments, the limiting value in (13) is attained, and the claim holds. Finally, we consider the case when (m_j) is bounded and (n_j) is unbounded. Going to a subsequence, we may assume that (m_j) has a constant value, say m , and $n_j \rightarrow \infty$. Then, for each j , $|A_j| \leq 2^m$. Using a subsequence again, we may assume that $|A_j| = r$ for some fixed r for all j . For each j , write $A_j = \{S_1(j), \dots, S_r(j)\}$. Choose a subsequence (j_k) such that $(S_i(j_k))_k$ converges weak* to some S_i for every $1 \leq i \leq r$. It is easy to see that $\{S_1, \dots, S_r\}$ is a collection of pairwise disjoint m - ∞ segments. From equation (13), we deduce that $\|x\| = \sum_{i=1}^r |S_i x|$, as desired. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 17 *Let (T_n) be as in Lemma 15, then $[T_n]$ contains a copy of c_0 .*

Proof: Let W be as in Lemma 16. Choose a subsequence (T_{n_k}) as given by Lemma 15. Then we have $\sum |\langle T_{n_k} w, v \rangle| < \infty$ for all $(w, v) \in W \times W$. But by Lemma 16, $W \times W$ is an i.p.n. subset of $JH \hat{\otimes}_\epsilon JH$. Hence Elton's extremal criterion [1] assures us that $[T_{n_k}]$ contains a copy of c_0 . $\blacksquare$

Theorem 18 *The space $JH \tilde{\otimes}_\epsilon JH$ is c_0 -saturated.*

Proof: For all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$E_m = K_{w*}(JH', (1 - P_m)JH) \quad \text{and} \quad F_m = K_{w*}((1 - P_m)'JH', JH).$$

Both E_m and F_m are isomorphic to a direct sum of a finite number of copies of JH , hence they are c_0 -saturated by Lemma 1. Let (S_n) be a normalized basic sequence in $JH \tilde{\otimes}_\epsilon JH$. If there exist a subsequence (R_n) of (S_n) and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that (R_n) is dominated by $((1 - P_m)R_n \oplus R_n(1 - P_m)') \in E_m \oplus F_m$, then (R_n) is equivalent to a sequence in $E_m \oplus F_m$, which is a c_0 -saturated space by Lemma 1. Thus $[R_n]$, and consequently $[S_n]$, contains a copy of c_0 . Otherwise, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and every subsequence (R_n) of S_n ,

$$\inf \left\{ \left\| \sum_n a_n(1 - P_m)R_n \right\| + \left\| \sum_n a_n R_n(1 - P_m)' \right\| : (a_n) \in c_{00}, \left\| \sum_n a_n R_n \right\| = 1 \right\} = 0.$$

Also, it is clear that for any $T \in JH \tilde{\otimes}_\epsilon JH$, $\lim_n (1 - P_n)T(1 - P_n)' = T$ in norm. Using these observations and a standard perturbation argument, we obtain a normalized block basis of (S_n) which is equivalent to some sequence (T_n) satisfying the hypotheses of Lemma 15. By Lemma 17, $[T_n]$ contains a copy of c_0 . Thus, so does $[S_n]$. ■

Hagler [4] proved that, in fact, JH has *property (S)*: every normalized weakly null sequence has a c_0 -subsequence. Coupled with the absence of ℓ^1 , property (S) implies c_0 -saturation. In [5], it was also shown that property (S) implies property (u). Thus, we may ask

Question: Does $JH \tilde{\otimes}_\epsilon JH$ has property (S) or property (u)?

References

- [1] J. Elton, *Extremely weakly unconditionally convergent series*, Israel J. Math. **40**(1981), 255-258.
- [2] V. F. Fonf, *On a property of Lindenstrauss-Phelps spaces*, Funct. Anal. Appl. **13**(1979), 79-80 (translated from Russian).

- [3] V. F. Fonf, *Polyhedral Banach spaces*, Matematicheskie Zametki **30**(1981), 627-634 (translated from Russian).
- [4] James Hagler, *A counterexample to several questions about Banach spaces*, Studia Math. **60**(1977), 289-308.
- [5] H. Knaust and E. Odell, *On c_0 -sequences in Banach spaces*, Israel J. Math. **67**(1989), 153-169.
- [6] Denny H. Leung, *Embedding ℓ^1 into tensor products of Banach spaces*, Functional Analysis (eds. E. Odell and H. Rosenthal), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1470, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991, 171-176.
- [7] Joram Lindenstrauss and Lior Tzafriri, "Classical Banach Spaces I, Sequence Spaces", Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1977.
- [8] H. Rosenthal, *A characterization of Banach spaces containing ℓ^1* , Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. (U.S.A.), **71**(1974), 2411-2413.
- [9] H. Rosenthal, Class Notes, Topics course in analysis, University of Texas at Austin.
- [10] H. Rosenthal, *Some aspects of the subspace structure of infinite dimensional Banach spaces*, Approximation Theory and Functional Analysis (ed. C. Chuy), Academic Press, 1990.
- [11] W. Ruess, *Duality and geometry of spaces of compact operators*, Functional Analysis: Surveys and Recent Results III, (eds. K.-D. Bierstedt and B. Fuchssteiner) Math. Studies, no. 90, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984, 59-78.
- [12] H. H. Schaefer, "Banach Lattices and Positive Operators", Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1974.
- [13] Z. Semadeni, "Banach Spaces of Continuous Functions I", Monografie Matematyczne, PWN-Polish Scientific Publishers 55, Warszawa, 1971.

Department of Mathematics
National University of Singapore
Singapore 0511
E-mail(bitnet) : matlhh@nusvm